



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/464,557	12/16/1999	BRIAN D. GANTT	30566.71US01	7734

22462 7590 02/14/2002

GATES & COOPER LLP
HOWARD HUGHES CENTER
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050
LOS ANGELES, CA 90045

EXAMINER

TRAN, MYLINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/14/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/454,557	BRIAN D. GANTT	
	Examiner Mylinh T Tran	Art Unit 2173	
<i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i>			
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 			
Status			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 December 1999</u> . 2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL. 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final. 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-11</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-6 and 8-11</u> is/are rejected. 7) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>7</u> is/are objected to. 8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
Attachment(s)			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u> .		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claims 1 and 10, it is not clear that "the input device" as being referred to.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda [US.6,166,718] in view of Frasier et al. [US.5,268,677] and further in view of Lumelsky et al. [US.5,162,779].

As to claims 1, 10 and 11, Takeda discloses displaying the three-dimensional space on a monitor attached to the computer (see abstract). Takeda cites "A cursor is displayed in a three-dimensionally displayed field as a plurality of cursor images three-dimensionally in a vertical array in the field..." read as the displaying the three-dimensional space; moving a cursor through the two-dimensions of the three-dimensional space according to a position of the input device attached to the computer and determining a position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space

relative to the two-dimensions (see column 2, lines 16-28). Takeda cites "...display means for displaying a field and a cursor three-dimensionally, ...for setting a three-dimensional coordinate value of a selected position in the field, setting a plurality of three-dimensional coordinate value of a selected position in the field, setting a plurality of three-dimensional coordinate values based on the three-dimensional coordinate value...." read as moving the cursor through the two-dimensions of the three-dimensional space according to a position of the input device and determining the position of the cursor. The difference between Takeda and the claim are the two-dimensional viewport of the three-dimensional space and the generating a visual representation of the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport. Frasier et al. shows two-dimensional viewport of the three-dimensional space (see abstract) Frasier et al. cites "A reduced viewport feature for a graphics display system...A two-dimensional input image plane in the form of a wireframe is transformed to a three-dimensional image...mapped as a two-dimensional projection onto the graphics display..." read as the two-dimensional viewport. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Takeda and Frasier et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space taught by Takeda to include the two-dimensional viewport of Frasier et al., in order to reduce the size of the normally visible area outside the viewing area as taught by Frasier et al.

While Frasier et al. teaches displaying the two-dimensional viewport of the three-dimensional space. Lumelsky et al. teaches generating a visual representation of the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative

to the two-dimensional viewport (see abstract). Lumelsky et al. cites "To further enhance the perception of depth, monoscopic depth cues are provided by varying the cursor's color, size, transparency and/or pattern as the cursor moves in depth" read as the visual representation of the cursor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Takeda, Frasier et al. and Lumelsky et al. before them at the time the invention was made to modify the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport as taught by Takeda and Frasier et al. to include the visual representation of the cursor of Lumelsky et al. As to claim 2, Lumelsky et al. also discloses wherein the generating step comprises generating the visual representation of the cursor using one or more human recognizable metaphors for three-dimensional distance cueing in order to provide an extra dimension of visual feedback to the operator navigating the cursor through the three-dimensional space related to the two dimensional viewport (column 3, lines 65 through column 4, lines 24).

As to claims 3 and 5, Lumelsky et al. teaches generating step comprises varying a brightness of the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport and the generating step comprises varying a color of the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport (column 3, lines 65 through column 4, lines 10).

As to claim 4, Lumelsky et al. also teaches the generating step comprises varying a reflectivity of the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport (column 2, lines 38-64).

As to claim 6, Lumelsky et al. shows the generating step comprises varying a composition of the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional view-port (column 4, lines 31-45).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takeda [US.6,166,718] in view of Frasier et al. [US.5,268,677], further in view of Lumelsky et al. [US.5,162,779] and further in view of Caddy [US. 4,578,766].

As to claims 8 and 9, the difference between Takeda, Frasier et al. and Lumelsky et al., and the claim are the generating step comprises adding and subtracting projection lines to the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport and the generating step comprises adding and subtracting tag along characters to the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport.

Caddy shows the projection lines and the tag along characters to the cursor (see abstract). Caddy cites "a conventional storage tube graphics display terminal having an addressable cross-hair cursor and a keyboard..." Cross-hair cursor is read as the project lines to the cursor. Caddy also cites "the graphical plot viewed on the display terminal is further enhanced by inclusion of labels, shaded areas, and reference

symbols and characters..." read as the tag along characters to the cursor. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Takeda, Frasier et al., Lumelsky et al and Caddy before them at the time the invention was made to modify the method for navigation a three-dimensional space taught by Takeda, Frasier et al., and Lumelsky et al to include the generating projection lines and characters to the cursor of Caddy, in order to provide a computer-aided process for producing original camera-ready graphical plots in full detail without requiring any manual drafting labor as taught by Caddy.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: the claim would be allowable because the prior art fails to teach or suggest concentric circles about the cursor to indicate the position of the cursor within the three-dimensional space relative to the two-dimensional viewport in combination with the other claim limitations.

Conclusion

Responses to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant desires fax a response, (703) 746-7238), may be used for formal After Final communications, (703) 746-7239 for Official communications, or (703) 746-7240 for Non-Official or draft communications. NOTE, A Request for Continuation (Rule 60 or 62) cannot be faxed.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for information facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mylinh Tran whose telephone number is (703) 308-1304. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8.00AM to 4.30PM

If attempt to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner 's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640,

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Mylinh Tran

Art Unit 2173

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE L. KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2100